

REMARKS

Claims 1, 5-8, 10 and 11 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 5-8 and 11 are amended. The amendments introduce no new matter. Claims 2-4, 12 and 13 are canceled without prejudice to, or disclaimer of, the subject matter recited those claims. A Request for Continued Examination is attached. Reconsideration of the application based on the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Office Action, in paragraph 3, maintains that the October 27, 2003 Information Disclosure Statement ("IDS") allegedly fails to comply with 37 C.F.R. §1.97 and 1.98 and MPEP §609. Applicant understands that the English-language abstract and arguments submitted in the October 19 Amendment After Final Rejection satisfy the Examiner's objection. Consideration of the references cited in Applicant's October 27, 2003 IDS is respectfully requested.

The Office Action, in paragraph 4, rejects claims 1-8 and 10-13 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Specifically, the Office Action asserts that independent claims 1, 11, 12 and 13 recite features that allegedly provide no clarity as to when, or if, steps are being performed, and that these claims allegedly recite recursive conditions. The cancellation of claims 12 and 13 renders the rejection of these claims moot.

Without conceding the propriety of the rejections of claims 1 and 11, claims 1 and 11 are amended to clarify that the data output section supplies the control tower with output data when the data is set through the output data setting section and that the setting operation of the data is detected by a microcomputer, as recited in claims 1, 5, 6, 8 and 11. Applicant adequately discloses such features in the specification at at least page 11, line 13 - page 14, line 12 and from page 17, line 3 - page 18, line 6. In particular, Applicant discloses that data required for driving the electronic control apparatus 16 is output from the microcomputer 12 of the simulation apparatus 10 when the user performs the setting operation of the various

control buttons 25 displayed on the C-panel screen 24. Further, when the store button 27 is used to start processing for storing event data, the setting operation of the various control buttons 25 is detected by the microcomputer 12. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action, in paragraph 6, indicates that claim 6 recites allowable subject matter. Specifically, the Office Action indicates that this indication will be held in abeyance pending the resolution of the formal rejection to this claim. For at least the reasons discussed above, the formal rejection of claim 6 should be withdrawn. As such, Applicant understands that claim 6 recites allowable subject matter. Claim 6 is amended into independent form to include all of the features of independent base claim 1 and intervening claim 2.

The Office Action, in paragraph 5, rejects claims 1-5, 7-8 and 10-13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,535,620 to Nichols in view of "The Design of History Mechanisms and their use in Collaborative Educational Simulations," by Katherine Plaisant et al. (hereinafter "Plaisant"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action, in paragraphs 5.1 and 5.9, asserts that Nichols and Plaisant, in combination, would have rendered obvious the combination of all of the features recited in claims 1 and 11. Without conceding the propriety of these rejections, claims 1 and 11 are amended to include the features recited in now-canceled claim 4.

The Office Action, in paragraph 5.4, asserts that Nichols and Plaisant, in combination, would have rendered obvious the feature of the event playback section starts playing back the setting operation automatically when a predetermined data is detected, as positively recited in independent claims 1 and 11 and now-canceled claim 4. The analysis of the Office Action fails for at least the following reasons.

Nether Nichols nor Plaisant teach, nor can they reasonably be considered to have suggested, the above-quoted feature. The Office Action, in paragraph 5.4, concedes that

Nichols does not teach this feature. The Office Action asserts that Plaisant, on page 10, teaches discretionary playback with features that are alleged to correspond to the above-quoted feature. Plaisant teaches session histories can be replayed immediately, edited, or saved for later recall and replay (page 10). Plaisant further teaches that once a history has been recorded, the visual historian functions as a history editor such that representative icons may be dragged to the left or right causing corresponding events to occur earlier or later during replay (page 10). Such disclosure, however, is directed to flexibility in the control of simulation history editing software during the playback. Plaisant does not disclose playing back the setting operation automatically when a predetermined data is detected. As such, it is unreasonable to assert that Plaisant teaches features combinable with Nichols that would have rendered obvious at least this feature.

The Office Action, in paragraph 5.5, asserts that Nichols and Plaisant, in combination, would have rendered obvious a waiting time setting section for setting a waiting time till starting playing back the setting operation, wherein the event playback section starts the playback when the waiting time set by the waiting time setting section has passed, as recited in claim 5. The analysis of the Office Action fails for at least the following reasons.

Neither Nichols nor Plaisant, individually or in combination, teach the above-quoted feature. The Office Action, in paragraph 5.5, concedes that Nichols does not teach this feature. The Office Action again references page 10 of the Plaisant disclosure and asserts that Plaisant teaches discretionary playback with features that are alleged to correspond to the above-quoted feature. As discussed above, on page 10, Plaisant discloses that session histories can be replayed immediately, edited or saved for later recall and replay. As also discussed above, Plaisant is merely teaching the flexibility of controlling simulation history editing software. Plaisant does not teach a waiting time setting section for setting a waiting time or playback when the waiting time set by the waiting time setting section has passed. As

such, it is unreasonable to assert that Plaisant teaches features combinable with Nichols that would have rendered obvious at least this feature.

The Office Action, in paragraph 5.7, asserts that Nichols would have rendered obvious the event data editing section includes a single waveform editing section for editing the relevant data into a predetermined signal waveform; and the signal waveform editing section includes a signal waveform registration section for registering the event data edited through the signal waveform editing section as signal waveform data, as recited in claim 8. The analysis of the Office Action fails for at least the following reasons.

The Office Action asserts that Nichols, in Figs. 2 and 3, teaches an engine control module with features that are alleged to correspond to the above-quoted feature. Figs. 2 and 3 of Nichols depict signal waveforms relating to fuel injectors of an engine with respect to the phase relationship between injector pulses and the overall engine management system (col. 9, lines 12-31). Nichols, however, does not disclose a signal waveform registration section for registering the event data edited through the signal waveform editing section as signal waveform data. In this regard, it is unreasonable to assert that a general signal waveform, as disclosed by Nichols, can be considered to correspond to the above-quoted feature. As such, it is unreasonable to assert that Nichols would have rendered obvious this feature, even in combination with Plaisant.

For at least the foregoing reasons, the applied references cannot reasonably be considered to have suggested the combinations of all of the features recited in independent claims 1, 5, 6, 8 and 11. Additionally, claims 7 and 10 would also have been reasonably suggested by the applied references for at least the respective dependence of these claims, directly or indirectly, on an allowable base claim, as well as for the separately patentable subject matter that each of these claims recites.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1, 5-8, 10 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the applied references are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1, 5-8, 10 and 11 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Christopher J. Wheeler
Registration No. 60,738

JAO:CJW/clf

Attachments:

Amendment Transmittal
Request for Continued Examination
Petition for Extension of Time

Date: December 19, 2007

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--